

A Jailhouse Lawyer's Manual

Chapter 6: An Introduction to Legal Documents

**Columbia Human Rights Law Review
8th Edition 2009**

LEGAL DISCLAIMER

A Jailhouse Lawyer's Manual is written and updated by members of the *Columbia Human Rights Law Review*. The law prohibits us from providing any legal advice to prisoners. This information is not intended as legal advice or representation nor should you consider or rely upon it as such. Neither the *JLM* nor any information contained herein is intended to or shall constitute a contract between the *JLM* and any reader, and the *JLM* does not guarantee the accuracy of the information contained herein. Additionally, your use of the *JLM* should not be construed as creating an attorney-client relationship with the *JLM* staff or anyone at Columbia Law School. Finally, while we have attempted to provide information that is up-to-date and useful, because the law changes frequently, we cannot guarantee that all information is current.

CHAPTER 6

AN INTRODUCTION TO LEGAL DOCUMENTS*

A. A. Introduction: The Right and Responsibilities of Self-Representation

You have the right to bring your own lawsuit and to represent yourself in court. This is called bringing a lawsuit *pro se*.¹ Although it is always helpful to have the aid of a lawyer, it is not always possible to get legal assistance, especially in the early stages of a lawsuit. If you plan to start a legal action, it is crucial that you familiarize yourself with the documents that you will need to provide to the court. Courts require that certain documents are prepared and filed at specific times in order to begin and maintain a lawsuit. The purpose of this Chapter is to give you a general introduction to legal documents and a basic framework that explains the order in which documents are required in most cases.

Each type of lawsuit described in the *JLM* has at least one plaintiff or petitioner and at least one defendant or respondent.² In some lawsuits, there may be more than one plaintiff. For example, several prisoners who were all mistreated in the same way can bring a lawsuit together. Your lawsuit will be stronger if you can show that you have been a victim of a regular practice that is illegal, or if you can demonstrate that several people suffered the same mistreatment. You may even be able to bring a lawsuit in the name of a group of people without having to ask them all to join your lawsuit as plaintiffs. Such a lawsuit is called a “class action” and may be very powerful.³ If you are suing prison officials who are mistreating several prisoners, but you are the only plaintiff, the prison officials can have the case thrown out by merely improving conditions for you and no one else. This is because the court only has power over those people named in the suit—once the prison officials have improved conditions for you, your case is “moot” and will be dismissed. If this happens, the court cannot do anything about the conditions or mistreatment of others unless another suit is brought. On the other hand, if you bring a class action naming all the prisoners who are suffering as plaintiffs, prison officials may have to improve conditions for everyone before the court can dismiss the case. You should try to find a lawyer for this type of case.

In some cases, there may also be more than one defendant. Under the rule of supervisor liability (*respondeat superior*), an employer may sometimes be held liable for the illegal acts of his or her employees. Therefore, you should always name as a defendant the individual who injured you, as well as that individual’s superiors up to the Commissioner of Corrections.

If you are a plaintiff, you would begin your lawsuit by notifying the court and the person you are suing that you intend to sue. This is done by filing papers (discussed in more detail below) with the court. In these initial papers, you explain the problem you are having and what you would like the court to do about it. Once the court receives these papers, the person you are suing is allowed to defend himself by filing papers with the court that respond to

* This Chapter was written by Taryn A. Merkl based in part on previous versions by Colleen Romaka and other former members of the Columbia Human Rights Law Review.

1. New York Prisoners’ Legal Services publishes a newsletter entitled “*Pro se*,” which discusses how to proceed *pro se* in various contexts. Many libraries have it. The newsletter is also available from Prisoners’ Legal Services. To subscribe, send in a request with your name, DIN number, and facility to Pro Se, 114 Prospect Street, Ithaca, NY 14850.

2. The terms “plaintiff” and “petitioner” are both used to refer to the person who brings a lawsuit. Similarly, the terms “defendant” and “respondent” are both used to refer to the person who is being sued. Which terms are used will vary depending on the court in which the case is brought.

3. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 (the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure laying out the procedures for class actions); N.Y. C.P.L.R. 901–09 (McKinney 2006) (the rule laying out the procedures for class actions in New York State courts).

your charges. At this point, you are generally given another opportunity to file more papers, in which you respond to what your opponent has stated in his papers. In most cases, this exchange of claims and responses to the charges occurs before the court makes any decisions on the substance (also called the “merits”) of the lawsuit itself.

B. B. The Legal Documents

All lawsuits, regardless of type, require the same basic legal documents. These documents usually fall into five categories: (1) papers needed to start the lawsuit; (2) supporting papers; (3) miscellaneous papers; (4) the answer from the party being sued; and (5) the reply to that answer by the party bringing the lawsuit. Although they serve the same functions, the names of these documents may differ depending upon the particular lawsuit you choose to file. For example, in a federal habeas corpus action, the paper needed to start a lawsuit is called a petition, while in a criminal appeal it is called a notice of appeal.

JLM Chapters 2 through 5 describe in detail the various types of lawsuits that you may bring and provide you with instructions on how to prepare the forms that you need for each type of suit. A summary of different types of lawsuits, based on New York procedure, is also given in *JLM* Chapter 5. This Part provides an overview of the legal documents you will need to prepare if you decide to bring one of the actions discussed in the *JLM*. The chart at the end of this Chapter matches the various names given to the five basic categories of papers to each type of lawsuit that you may bring.

What comes to most people’s minds when they think about a lawsuit is a courtroom trial. However, before any case actually gets into court, certain legal documents must be prepared and filed with the court. If you are appearing (bringing a lawsuit) *pro se* (without a lawyer), you are responsible for preparing the necessary documents. Therefore, it is important that you read Chapters 2 through 5 of the *JLM*, and carefully follow the directions on how to write the necessary documents. This Part discusses the functions of the five basic types of legal documents necessary to start and maintain the various legal actions.

1. Papers Needed to Start a Lawsuit

Once you have determined what type of action you would like to bring, you must file papers with the court explaining why you are seeking help from the court (pleadings). In these documents, you will usually state what your opponent has done to you and what you want the court to do about it. You will also explain the basis of the court’s jurisdiction (power) to hear your case. Depending upon what type of lawsuit you bring, the names of the papers may differ. The chart at Appendix A of this Chapter provides the names of these papers for each lawsuit. You should refer to the section of the *JLM* describing your legal problem in detail to determine how these documents should be prepared.

2. Supporting Papers

In the papers that you file to start a lawsuit you will make certain claims about what your opponent did to you and why you are seeking help from the court. At this point in most lawsuits, the court will need some sort of evidence that supports your claims. Two types of supporting evidence, Affidavits and Memorandums, are discussed below:

(a) Affidavits

Supporting papers usually take the form of an affidavit. An affidavit is a sworn (either notarized or signed by a friend of the court) written statement, by a party to the lawsuit, or by a witness, supporting the claims you made in your starting papers. An affidavit’s purpose is to provide the court with some factual evidence that supports your claims. Therefore, it should contain specific facts. It may consist of your own testimony and/or that of someone else who witnessed or has firsthand knowledge of the facts of your claim.

(b) Memorandum of Law

In some suits, a legal memorandum (or brief) is required. A legal memorandum is a statement of the law (as opposed to the facts) on a particular legal issue. A memorandum discusses the legal arguments upon which your claim is based. In your memorandum, you present the facts of your case, and compare them to similar cases. The memorandum of law serves a purpose similar to that of the affidavit—it demonstrates support for the claims that you made in your starting papers. The legal memorandum, an example of which appears in Appendix B of this Chapter, should begin with a statement of the facts in your case. The body of the memorandum should deal with all of the legal issues that you think arise from the facts of your case. The legal issues will be based on your legal rights or laws that provide a privilege. You should research these questions of law and explain to the court how other courts have dealt with the issues you are raising. Chapter 2 of the *JLM*, “Introduction to Legal Research,” explains how to research an issue in the law library.

3. Miscellaneous Papers

You may also file miscellaneous papers, which usually deal with procedural questions of law (the process by which your case is decided). These questions of law differ from substantive questions of law (the factual and legal issues of your case), but they nevertheless can affect your chances of success in the lawsuit. For example, they may include a request for a lawyer, whose expertise could make the difference between whether you win or lose your case. They may also include a request to file (or proceed) as a poor person, known as *in forma pauperis*, which would free you from having to pay the normal fees and filing costs necessary to bring a lawsuit.⁴ The miscellaneous papers that you will need to file will differ depending on the type of lawsuit you are bringing. You should refer to the chart at Appendix A of this Chapter to determine what papers are appropriate for your particular lawsuit. You should also refer to the specific section of the *JLM* that discusses your legal problem in detail in order to determine how to prepare these documents.

4. Answering Papers from the Opposing Party

The party you sue is required to answer your starting papers. There are several ways to answer. The answering party may simply admit or deny the allegations in your papers. The answering party may also state that he does not know if your statements are true. This is the equivalent of a denial.⁵ If the party you have sued answers without replying to one of your factual allegations, the court will conclude that he has admitted that your allegation is true.⁶

Another option that the defendant has is to attack the sufficiency of your starting papers by raising certain defenses.⁷ The opposing party will typically raise these types of defenses in a motion to dismiss your complaint. If the opposing party wins such a motion, the court has the option of either dismissing your case or granting you the opportunity to amend your complaint and correct the errors. If you are given an opportunity to amend your complaint,

4. Under the Prison Litigation Reform Act (“PLRA”), prisoners filing claims in court are required to pay full court filing fees. The full fee will gradually be deducted from your prison account. For a fuller discussion of the PLRA and how it affects your rights, see *JLM* Chapter 14.

5. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(b) (rule on defenses and forms of denials for actions in federal court); N.Y. C.P.L.R. 3018(a) (McKinney 1991) (rule for denials and defenses in New York State courts).

6. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(d) (federal rule regarding the effect of a party’s failure to deny allegations); N.Y. C.P.L.R. 3018(a) (McKinney 1991) (rule regarding the effect of a party’s failure to deny allegations in New York State courts).

7. For a list of the seven defenses that may be made by motion under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b). For a list of comparable grounds on which a motion may be made in New York courts, see N.Y. C.P.L.R. 3211(a) (McKinney 2005). You must check the court rules for your particular state or federal court for a complete list of defenses.

you should think of the amended complaint as new starting papers, which your opponent needs to answer.

An example of an answer that would attack the sufficiency of your starting papers is a ***motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim***. By filing this motion, your opponent argues you have no legal claim.⁸ For example, you might want to sue a prison official because you feel you do not get to spend enough time outside each day. But, if there is no law requiring prison officials to allow prisoners to be outdoors for a certain number of hours each day, your claim could be dismissed upon the prison official's motion because no matter what the facts were, you could not show the official violated a law. In this example, the judge would look at the pleadings (the papers you filed to start the case and your opponent's motion to dismiss), and would dismiss your case because there would be no basis for the court to give any relief for that claim.

Another type of answer that your opponent can submit is a ***motion for summary judgment***. In a summary judgment motion, the opposing party states that there are no facts in dispute (as opposed to legal issues in dispute) and argues that there is no way that you can introduce facts to prove your claim. Therefore, he is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.⁹ This means that a judge may decide the case without the case ever going before a jury. For example, you might bring a Section 1983 action¹⁰ claiming that your constitutional right under the Eighth Amendment to be protected against "cruel and unusual punishment" was violated because a prison guard hit you. The opposing party might file a summary judgment motion claiming one violent incident does not establish "cruel and unusual punishment" within the meaning of the Eighth Amendment.¹¹ The judge will read the legal papers and consider the facts in the light most favorable to the non-moving party (the party that opposes the summary judgment motion). This means that the judge will give the benefit of the doubt to the party opposing summary judgment. If the judge believes that there is no way you can demonstrate that the single incident violated the Eighth Amendment, the motion for summary judgment will be granted. If the judge thinks that a reasonable jury could find in your favor, however, then he will deny summary judgment, and your case will move forward toward trial.

Summary judgment is different than a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim. In a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim, the judge only relies on the pleadings (allegations submitted to the court) to make a decision. However, when your opponent files a motion for summary judgment, the judge decides the motion based on affidavits submitted by both sides. This means that if your opponent submits an affidavit in support of a summary judgment motion, you have the right to introduce affidavits to support your claim and oppose the motion.¹² When you are opposing a motion for summary judgment, you should demonstrate in an affidavit that there are disputed facts that, if considered by a reasonable

8. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6); N.Y. C.P.L.R. 3211(a)(7) (McKinney 2005).

9. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 56 (the federal rule for summary judgment); N.Y. C.P.L.R. 3212 (McKinney 2005) (the New York rule for summary judgment).

10. See Chapter 16 of the *JLM* for a discussion of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

11. See Chapter 24 of the *JLM* for an explanation of Eighth Amendment protections in assault cases.

12. If you would like to introduce any documents to support your opposition to the motion, these must be "authenticated" by an affidavit unless they are already in the court's record. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e)(1); *Canada v. Blain's Helicopters, Inc.*, 831 F.2d 920, 925 (9th Cir. 1987). This means you should have someone who has knowledge swear that the documents are genuine and reliable. A person has the requisite knowledge to authenticate a document in an affidavit if he could authenticate a document during trial under the evidence rules. See, e.g., Fed. R. Evid. 901. Also note that some documents, such as public records and newspapers, are "self-authenticating," which means that they are considered so trustworthy that they do not need to be sworn to in an affidavit. See Fed. R. Evid. 902.

person (like someone on a jury), would tend to support your claim. If possible, you should seek to amend your complaint (or other introductory papers) to correct any possible defects.

In addition to attempts to have your case dismissed, your opponent may choose to file answering papers that require you to file more papers. These types of answers may include a ***motion for a more definite statement*** because your complaint was not specific enough.¹³ This type of motion may be granted in order to give the party being sued a chance to understand and answer the charges made. It may also simply be a delaying device, used to buy more time for your opponent. If this motion is granted, you will have to amend your complaint to explain your claims in more detail. An answering party may also file a ***counterclaim*** against you.¹⁴ If a counterclaim is brought against you, this means that the opposing party is alleging that you did some harm to him. For example, if you sue a prison guard for assaulting you, the prison guard may answer in turn with a claim that you injured him instead. If a counterclaim is filed, you must file a reply stating your version of the events.¹⁵

Finally, the party you sued may not be able to respond to your charges within the time limits given to answer. If this happens, he will probably request an extension from the court.¹⁶ Courts usually grant these requests. If, however, the opposing party does not file (1) an answer to your charges; (2) a motion attacking the validity of your charges; or, (3) a motion for an extension of time, you have the right to request that the judge enter a default judgment, which is a judgment in your favor.¹⁷ A default judgment assumes that your charges are true because the party you sued did not respond to them. To get a default judgment, you must file a request that a default judgment be entered with the clerk of the court. You will later request the same court to order the relief you requested in your starting papers.

5. Your Reply to the Opposing Party's Answer

Once you receive the opposing party's answer, you should read it closely. Carefully reading your opponent's answering papers will help you determine the arguments he will make as the case progresses. For example, an opponent might raise an affirmative defense in the answer, such as a claim of contributory negligence.¹⁸ Once you know what facts and arguments your opponent will use to prove a claim, you will be able to counter them effectively. (You should also note that an affirmative defense may not be used at trial if it was not raised in the answer to the complaint,¹⁹ although a court will usually grant the defendant permission to amend an answer to add an affirmative defense).

In some instances, such as when the opposing party files a counterclaim in his or her answer, you may be required to respond to the charges. If a reply is required by the court and you do not file, everything in the answer will be accepted as true by the judge and you will lose your lawsuit. Even if you are not required to reply to the opposing party's answer, but the court allows you to do so, you should go ahead and prepare a well-reasoned reply to the statements that your opponent makes. It is in your best interest to file and serve a written reply whenever it is possible to do so.

Chapters 9 to 13, 15 to 17, and 20 to 22 explain in detail the types of claims you can bring and the kinds of documents you will need to maintain such actions. In each Chapter, there

13. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(e); N.Y. C.P.L.R. 3024(a) (McKinney 1991).

14. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 13; N.Y. C.P.L.R. 3019(a) (McKinney 1991).

15. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(a); N.Y. C.P.L.R. 3011 (McKinney 1991).

16. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b); N.Y. C.P.L.R. 2004 (McKinney 1997).

17. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 55; N.Y. C.P.L.R. 3215 (McKinney 2005).

18. This means that the other side will say that your carelessness somehow helped cause the injury and therefore they are not (fully) responsible.

19. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(d); N.Y. C.P.L.R. 3211(e) (McKinney 2005).

are examples of the papers you need to file. The table in Appendix A will help you to familiarize yourself with the names of the papers each suit requires.

C. C. Conclusion

If you are thinking about taking legal action, you should take the following steps:

- (1) identify the law that has been broken;
- (2) determine the type of lawsuit you need to file; and
- (3) gather the necessary documents.

Appendix A of this Chapter lists types of lawsuits and forms the court requires for each type of suit.

If you file a lawsuit, you will need:

- (1) papers to start a lawsuit;
- (2) papers supporting your lawsuit; and
- (3) other important papers required by the court.

After you have filed your lawsuit, the opposing party should respond to your claim. If the opposing party responds, you should reply. If the opposing party does not respond, you should file papers with the court requesting a default judgment.

APPENDIX A

LEGAL DOCUMENTS TABLE

Type of Suit	Papers to Start Suit	Supporting Papers	Miscellaneous Papers	Answers	Replies
Criminal Appeal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notice of Appeal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papers to Perfect Appeal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor Person's Papers • Bail Request Papers • Papers for Requesting Extension of Time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposing Brief 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reply Brief
Article 440	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notice of Motion to Vacate Judgment • Notice of Motion to Set Aside Sentence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affidavits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor Person's Papers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answer 	
Federal Habeas Corpus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Petition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affidavits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion for Appointment of Counsel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traverse
State Habeas Corpus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Petition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check requirements of your state 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notice of Time and Place of Hearing • Poor Person's Papers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Return 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reply
42 U.S.C. § 1983	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summons • Complaint • Order to Show Cause and Temporary Restraining Order 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affidavit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor Person's Papers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answer • Motion to Dismiss 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reply
Tort Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notice of Intention to File Claim • Notice for Permission to File Late Claim • Verified Tort Claim 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affidavits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affidavit to Request Reduction of Filing Fees • Notice of Appeal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demand for Bill of Particulars 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bill of Particulars
Article 78	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Order to Show Cause • Notice of Petition • Verified Petition • Request for Judicial Intervention • Application for an Index Number 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affidavits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affidavit to Request Reduction or Waiver of Filing Fees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reply

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE MEMORANDUM OF LAW²⁰

This Appendix contains an example of a memorandum of law, or a brief. This particular memorandum was submitted to a federal district court in opposition to defendants' motion for summary judgment on a Section 1983 claim for excessive force in violation of the Eighth Amendment.²¹ We are including this in the *JLM* so you may study the form and style of a brief. The names of all parties and witnesses and facts have been changed. The footnotes have been added to clarify and explain things to you but should not go in your memorandum. In addition, you should not use the cases cited in this sample without verifying they are still good law. See *JLM*, Chapter 2, for information on Legal Research.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

		X
<hr/>		
Robert K. Simms,		:
		:
Petitioner,		:
		:
		:
- against -		:
		:
Corrections Officer William D. Bennett,		:
New York State Penitentiary, and Sergeant		:
Paul J. Wright,		:
		:
Respondents.		:
		X
<hr/>		

PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Plaintiff Robert K. Simms ("Simms") respectfully submits this Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

On January 17, 1990, defendant William D. Bennett ("Bennett"), a corrections officer at the New York State Penitentiary ("Penitentiary"), physically assaulted and threatened to beat and kill Robert Simms, an inmate awaiting processing. Defendant Paul J. Wright ("Wright"), Bennett's supervisor, knew of the attack and death threats, yet did nothing to intervene and protect Robert Simms. Simms brings this lawsuit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Officer Bennett for his malicious and sadistic use of excessive force and against Sergeant Wright for his deliberate indifference to the attack and threats of beating and death.

20. This memorandum of law is based on a submission drafted by Daniel M. Abuhoff and Nicole A. Ortsman-Dauer at Debevoise & Plimpton LLP.

21. For more information on how to bring a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, see Chapter 16 of the *JLM*. Chapter 24 of the *JLM* discusses the law that applies to your right to be free from assault in prison.

Defendants have moved for summary judgment arguing (i) Simms suffered *de minimis* physical injuries and unactionable psychological pain; (ii) the force used by Bennett, if any, was reasonable and necessary; and (iii) Wright did not act with deliberate indifference because he did not witness the physical attack and threats of beating and death. Defendants are wrong on both the law and the facts.

First, the use of force here was more than *de minimis*. Bennett shoved Simms, pushed him into a wall, swung him around the search room, and punched him in the arms, legs, and face, while simultaneously screaming that he should shoot, stab, and beat him. As a result of the attack, Simms suffered more than *de minimis* physical and mental pain, sustaining not only bruises to his arms, legs, and face, but also serious and extensive mental pain lasting to the present. The Eighth Amendment's prohibition on the unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain encompasses both physical and mental pain.

Second, the evidence demonstrates that there was no need for force. Simms provoked no attack. He was not violent. He did not refuse to follow Officer Bennett's instructions. As indicated by the content of Bennett's threats, the attack—fueled by Bennett's personal feelings of hatred and disgust—was malicious, sadistic, and for the very purpose of causing Simms harm.

Finally, the supervising officer, Sergeant Wright, was deliberately indifferent to Simms's plight. Wright admits to hearing noise from the search room. Indeed, Wright was told by Simms what was going on. Yet, Wright chose to do nothing to stop the attack.

Defendants' motion for summary judgment should be denied.

1. STATEMENT OF FACTS

(a) Robert Simms' Child Pornography Convictions

Plaintiff Robert Simms, a black male in his late forties, is a convicted child pornographer. The last conviction took place on January 10, 1990. As a result of that conviction, Simms was sentenced to five years imprisonment, which he served at the New York State Penitentiary from January 17, 1990 to January 16, 1995. (Simms Aff. ¶ 3).²²

a. Officer Bennett Attacks Robert Simms and Sergeant Wright Does Nothing

Simms arrived at the Penitentiary at approximately 9:30 a.m. on January 17, 1990. He was led into the bullpen holding cell and sat on a bench as he waited to be processed. In addition to Simms, there was only one other person in the bullpen. (Simms Aff. ¶ 5; Simms Dep. 20:12–13).

On the morning of January 17, 1990, defendant Officer Bennett and Officer Howard Lewis (“Lewis”) worked the 8:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. shift in the search area of the Penitentiary. (Bennett Dep. 35:25–27; Lewis Dep. 24:8–10). Sergeant Wright, working the same shift, was the supervisor on duty. (Wright Dep. 22:36–24:5).

Corrections officers at the Penitentiary all have the opportunity to learn incoming inmates' charges. Not only do corrections officers discuss, on occasion, inmates' charges, but officers working in the booking and search areas have access to that information. (Bennett Dep. 43:15–19, 52:9–55:12, 62:24–64:14; Lewis Dep. 27:7–15, 36:24–37:5). Simms sat on the bullpen bench for approximately one hour when he heard Officer Bennett shouting from inside the search room, located a few yards from the bullpen: “He's pond scum. That low-life piece of trash kiddie porn lover deserves to be killed. Someone should kill him.” (Simms Aff. ¶ 12; Simms Dep. 21:15–24:7; Compl. Pt. II at 1).

In order to determine the source of and reason for the threats, Simms stood up from the bullpen bench and approached the bullpen bars. Bennett approached the bullpen, stood very close to Simms, and screamed: “You revolting cradle robber. Get the hell out of my face, you pedophile. You nauseate

22. Citations to “Simms Aff. ¶ ___” refer to the Affidavit of Robert K. Simms, dated August 15, 1998. Citations to “___ Dep.” refer to the transcript of the deposition for the individual specified. Citations to “Compl.” refer to Simms' Complaint. Citations to “Def. Mem.” refer to the Defendants' Memorandum of Law. The symbol “¶” refers to a particular paragraph in that document. A citation that reads 20:12-13 indicates that the cited information can be found on page 20, lines 12 through 13 of the referenced document.

me! Get the hell away from the bars before I beat you senseless.” Simms was terrified and did not know how to respond. He had done nothing to provoke the threats. (Simms Aff. ¶ 12; Compl. Pt. II at 1).

Officer Bennett, becoming even more aggressive, continued his verbal attack for the next half hour. He screamed: “If I had a knife, I’d stab you in your chest right now. Get away from the bars you disgusting pond scum pervert!” Simms became very anxious. He thought he was going to be killed by Officer Bennett or by other inmates to whom Bennett would reveal his charges. (Simms Aff. ¶ 13; Simms Dep. 24:7–13; Compl. Pt. II at 1–2).

A few minutes later, Simms was retrieved from the bullpen and escorted to the search room where Officer Bennett stood, glaring at him. (Simms Aff. ¶ 14; Simms Dep. 26:14–25; Compl. Pt. II at 6). Officer Lewis and approximately four to six other corrections officers—including Officer Felding, who booked Simms that morning and prepared his booking sheet containing his child pornography charges—also stood in the room, all staring at Simms and Bennett with expressions of expectation. (Simms Aff. ¶ 15; Compl. Pt. II at 4).

Officer Bennett slammed shut the search room door and pushed Simms from behind with two hands, towards the wall where the other officers stood. He pushed Simms approximately ten times and swung him around the room. Bennett slapped Simms’ face and body and again began to scream threats of beating and death at Simms. Bennett next shoved Simms into the wall next to the corrections officers while screaming: “You vile scumbag. I should kill you. If I had my knife, I’d carve you up. If I had my revolver, I’d blow you to shreds. You are a sick maggot.” Simms was terrified and kept still. (Simms Aff. ¶ 16; Simms Dep. 28:12–30:25; Compl. Pt. II at 3–4).

Officer Bennett continued to push Simms into the wall while yelling that he could not stand the sight of Simms. Simms finally asked Bennett what he had done to deserve this attack and reminded Bennett he did not know the details of Simms’ case. Bennett responded by yelling that he did not give “two hoots” about the circumstances of Simms’ case; he was going to carve him up anyway. Bennett pushed Simms. Simms ricocheted off the wall, and Bennett continued to scream obscenities and threats of beating and death. Officer Lewis and the others in the search room looked on with amusement. (Simms Aff. ¶ 17; Simms Dep. 29:15–30:10; Compl. Pt. II at 6–7).

At some point, Officer Bennett demanded that Simms stand in a particular spot in the search room. Each time Simms moved to the requested spot, Bennett taunted him and screamed, “No, this way!,” pointing to a different spot. He then swung Simms around the room, grabbing his arm and launching him off. Bennett repeated this several times. (Simms Aff. ¶ 18; Simms Dep. 28:7–29:6).

Eventually, Bennett screamed that Simms should strip. Simms complied and removed his shirt. He never refused or questioned Bennett’s order. When Simms put his shirt on an empty chair in the room, however, Bennett flew into a rage. He whipped Simms’ shirt around in the air above his head, screaming that Simms was a repulsive child pornographer. Bennett prepared to punch Simms again. Simms turned his body to avoid being hit and called out for the sergeant. (Simms Aff. ¶ 16; Simms Dep. 28:9–30:12, 33:14–20, 35:8–29).

Sergeant Wright heard “loud screaming” coming from the search room and went to investigate. (Wright Dep. 28:7–9, 30:22–25, 50:7–25). As Wright appeared at the door, Bennett acted as if nothing were wrong. Simms told Wright that he was glad Wright had arrived and that he needed Wright’s help. Wright cut Simms off and told him to “shut the hell up and take off your clothes,” to which Simms replied, “You’re in this too! This is unbelievable.” Simms did not question Wright’s order to strip. Rather, he took off his pants. Bennett strip-searched him. (Simms Aff. ¶ 20; Simms Dep. 30:21–32:12, 39:8–40:2; Compl. Pt. II at 8; Wright Dep. 32:20–23, 52:19–21; Bennett Dep. 49:4–20).

Once the strip search was completed, Simms told Wright that Bennett had physically assaulted him and threatened to beat, stab, and kill him. Wright responded, “Well, this is jail!” and walked out of the search room, leaving Simms alone with Bennett and the other officers. (Simms Aff. ¶ 4; Davis Dep. 28:7–29:15; Wright Dep. 15:02–16:20 (testifying that Davis had a complaint about the officers)).

Once Sergeant Wright left the search room, Simms dressed and Bennett resumed threatening him. Bennett again shoved Simms, sending him flying across the search room. Bennett screamed, “You are a piece of crap! You are a disgusting kiddie porn loving animal who deserves to die. I am going to make

sure someone's going to kill you. Your days are numbered." (Simms Aff. ¶ 18; Simms Dep. 40:15–42:30; Compl. Pt. II at 8). Bennett then led Simms out of the search room and screamed, "Send him to protective custody and get him out of my face. He gets off on little girls!" (Simms Aff. ¶ 20; Simms Dep. 41:18–22; Compl. Pt. II at 9). After spending approximately forty-five minutes in the search room, Simms was taken to a cell in protective custody where inmates are kept alone in separate cells that are kept locked for most of the day. Simms did not want to be housed in protective custody after the assault. He feared he would be more vulnerable to attack by defendants or others because there would be no witnesses. (Simms Aff. ¶ 22; Simms Dep. 35:3–23, 40:21–42:3, 56:15–58:4; Compl. Pt. II at 10).

(c) Robert Simms' Physical and Mental Pain Resulting from the Attack

As a result of the attack, Simms sustained bruises on his arms, legs, and face. He requested medical attention the day after the incident. By the time Simms saw a doctor—a week later—these injuries were no longer visible. (Simms Aff. ¶ 24; Simms Dep. 44:12–18, 48:23–50:2; Compl. Pt. II at 5).

In addition to the physical injuries, Simms suffered extreme and extensive mental pain. Not only was he humiliated and shocked by the search, but for the entire time he was housed at the Penitentiary, he was anxious and terrified that Bennett, Lewis, and Wright were going to beat or kill him—either by themselves or by encouraging other inmates—and cover it up. Simms felt hopeless. He became depressed and contemplated suicide. To this day, Simms suffers from nightmares about the attack. (Simms Aff. ¶ 29; Simms Dep. 49:15–51:12, 52:14–15; Compl. Pt. II at 5).

On January 18 and 19, Simms made several visits to the Mental Health Clinic. He was depressed, aggravated, and in despair. He did not want to be housed in protective custody where no one could witness any further attack. (Mental Health Evaluation Sheet, dated January 18, 1990). One nurse specifically noted that the "Problem" was that Simms was harassed by corrections officers because of his charge. (*Id.*)²³. Simms also received help for his psychological pain from Mark Denby, a Muslim mullah (religious leader) in Simms' community, and Dr. Margaret Phillips, Simms' therapist. These individuals visited Simms on numerous occasions while he was at the Penitentiary. After Simms finished serving his sentence in 1995, he continued to meet with Dr. Phillips, with whom he often spoke about the assault. (Simms Aff. ¶ 26; Simms Dep. 44:16–17, 53:18–19, 57:14–28; Compl. Pt. II at 5–7).

(d) Robert Simms' Complaint and the "Investigation"

On January 19, two days after the attack, Simms wrote a letter to Warden Frank Boston detailing the physical abuse and death threats prompted by his child pornography charges. He also noted Sergeant Wright's unconcerned reaction. (Simms Aff. ¶ 28). Captain Sharon Grant conducted an investigation, then wrote a report to Warden Boston on January 26. Of course, Grant concluded that there was no merit to Simms' Claim. (Grant Report).

2. ARGUMENT

The standards for summary judgment²⁴ are well settled. The moving party²⁵ bears the burden of establishing that there are no genuine issues of material fact in dispute²⁶. *See, e.g., Consarc Corp. v. Marine Midland Bank, N.A.*, 996 F.2d 568, 572 (2d Cir. 1993). This standard bars the court from resolving disputed issues of fact. If there are material factual issues, the court must deny summary judgment. *See, e.g., Knight v. U.S. Fire Ins. Co.*, 804 F.2d 9, 11 (2d Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, 480 U.S. 932

23. "Id" means that the author is citing to the same source that the author cited to immediately prior. In this case, "Id" refers to the Mental Health Evaluation Sheet, dated January 18, 1990.

24. "Summary judgment" is a legal term which means that a judge can decide the case in one party's favor without the case ever going to a jury because the facts are not in dispute and the judge can make a ruling on the law.

25. The "moving party" is the person who made the motion to the court asking the court to do something. In this case, the moving party is Officer Bennett, who is asking the court to decide the case in his favor at the summary judgment stage instead of going forward to a trial.

26. When a party claims that there are "no genuine issues of material fact in dispute," that means that all the parties agree about the facts, or a neutral third party would have to say that the facts seem to heavily favor one party's story over the other's as the real version of events.

(1987). In evaluating whether there are factual issues, the court is to view the evidence in the light most favorable to the non-moving party²⁷ and draw all permissible inferences²⁸ in the non-moving party's favor. *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 247 (1986). However, assessments of credibility, conflicting versions of events, and the weight to be assigned to evidence are for the jury, not the court. *See id.* at 255.

D. A. Officer Bennett's Attack On Robert Simms Violated The Eighth Amendment

The Eighth Amendment prohibits the "unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain"²⁹ and is the source of claims for excessive force under Section 1983. *Whitley v. Albers*, 475 U.S. 312, 319 (1986). Analysis of an excessive force claim contains both objective and subjective inquiries.³⁰ An official's conduct violates the Eighth Amendment when (i) the conduct is "objectively, sufficiently serious," and (ii) the prison official acts with a "sufficiently culpable [guilty] state of mind." *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 834 (1994) (internal quotation marks omitted).

(a) Officer Bennett's Conduct Was Sufficiently Serious.

Defendants argue that summary judgment should be granted because (i) Simms' physical injuries, if any, were *de minimis*,³¹ and (ii) Simms' psychological injuries are not serious enough to justify continuing this Section 1983 case. As demonstrated below, however, the physical injuries and psychological pain suffered by Robert Simms were sufficiently serious to satisfy the Eighth Amendment standard.

(i) The Use of Force Was More Than *De Minimis*

The objective component of a claim for excessive force under the Eighth Amendment is satisfied if the injury suffered results from something more than a *de minimis* use of force. *See Hudson v. McMillian*, 503 U.S. 1, 9–10 (1992); *Davidson v. Flynn*, 32 F.3d 27, 29 (2d Cir. 1994). Significant injury, that is "injury that requires medical attention or leaves permanent marks," is not required. *Hudson*, 503 U.S. at 7–8, 13 ("The absence of serious injury is .†.†. relevant to the Eighth Amendment inquiry but does not end it.").

As an initial matter, defendants contend that Officer Bennett never used force against Robert Simms or even had any physical contact with him. (Def. Mem. 7). This argument, however, is hotly disputed and thus summary judgment must be denied. *See, e.g., Allah v. Cox*, No. 96-CV-1225, 1998 WL 725939, at *2 n.2 (N.D.N.Y. Oct. 9, 1998) (summary judgment denied where corrections officer's version of events is expressly contradicted by inmate).

Alternatively, defendants contend that the force used by Bennett—which defendants dismiss as mere grabbing and pulling—was *de minimis*. (Def. Mem. 5–7). But the evidence shows that Simms was shoved, pushed into a wall, swung around the search room, and punched—all while being threatened with further beatings and death for approximately forty-five minutes in the search room. (Simms Aff. ¶¶ 12–13; Simms Dep. 25:24–26:16, 32:2–3; Simms Stmt., dated January 19, 1990).

27. The "non-moving party" is the person who did not make the motion to the court. Here, the non-moving party is Simms, who is opposing Officer Bennett's motion for summary judgment. Simms wants the case to go forward to a trial, instead of being decided in Officer Bennett's favor by a judge.

28. To "draw all permissible inferences" means that the court should take the facts and make any and all favorable assumptions that the facts can support which would favor the non-moving party, Simms. Because a judge ruling on summary judgment is ending the case before it goes to trial, the judge must give "the benefit of the doubt" to the party opposing summary judgment.

29. "Wanton infliction of pain" means excessive, cruel, or immoral infliction of pain.

30. "Objective" means as viewed by an outsider, sometimes referred to as the ordinary "reasonable person." "Subjective" means how a specific person viewed the incident.

31. "De minimis" is a legal term that means something has occurred in such a small quantity that it is not significant, and there is thus no legal remedy. Here, Officer Bennett is arguing that Simms' physical injuries were *de minimis*. This means Officer Bennett is trying to claim that Simms was not hurt badly enough for the law to take notice of his injuries.

Defendants cite a number of cases to support their argument that the use of force against Simms was *de minimis* as a matter of law. None of these cases is on point. They are either decided on grounds other than the use of force or involve momentary uses of force dramatically different from the repeated and continuous physical assault and death threats inflicted on Robert Simms. See *Reyes v. Koehler*, 815 F. Supp. 109, 114 (S.D.N.Y. 1993) (summary judgment granted for defendant where inmate did not allege malice or intent to cause harm and where defendant's pushing plaintiff against wall was "a momentary act, of such limited duration as to belie any inference of malicious or sadistic intent to cause harm") (internal quotation marks omitted); *Harris v. Keane*, 962 F. Supp. 397, 408 n.12 (S.D.N.Y. 1997) (squeezing inmate's finger once is *de minimis*) (emphasis added); *Candelaria v. Coughlin*, 787 F. Supp. 368, 374–75 (S.D.N.Y. 1992) (use of force *de minimis* where inmate did not allege any "repeated or continuous grabbing" or any physical injury), *aff'd*, 979 F.2d 845 (2d Cir. 1992).

Simms suffered bruises to his arms, legs, and face. (Simms Aff. ¶ 20; Simms Dep. 54:10–24). Such visible injuries are more than sufficient to sustain an Eighth Amendment action. See, e.g., *Griffin v. Crippen*, 193 F.3d 89, 91–92 (2d Cir. 1999) (reversing district court's determination that inmate's bruised shin and swelling over left knee were *de minimis* as a matter of law); *Smith v. Marcellus*, 917 F. Supp. 168, 171–73 (W.D.N.Y. 1995) (abrasion under left eye, small laceration near right ear, four superficial skin tears on upper calf, and slightly swollen wrist, resulting from attack by corrections officers, constitutes sufficient injury).

Defendants make much of the fact that plaintiff was not given medical treatment for his bruises. (Def. Mem. 7–8). However, Simms asked for treatment. (Simms Aff. ¶ 1). Defendants cannot be relieved of responsibility for the physical abuse of Robert Simms because they refused him medical treatment for at least a week after abusing him. The provision of medical treatment, in any event, is merely one fact to be weighed by the jury in assessing whether the physical force was more than *de minimis*. See *Robison v. Via*, 821 F.2d 913, 924 (2d Cir. 1987) (plaintiff's failure to seek medical treatment for injuries not fatal to Section 1983 claim).

(ii) Simms Can Recover for His Psychological Pain

Were there any question as to Bennett's use of more than *de minimis* physical force on Simms—and there should be none—Simms' psychological pain provides a separate basis for recovery. The intentional infliction of psychological pain can form the basis of a Section 1983 claim where the pain suffered is more than *de minimis*. The Supreme Court has stated:

[T]he Eighth Amendment prohibits the unnecessary and wanton infliction of "pain," rather than "injury." "Pain" in its ordinary meaning surely includes a notion of psychological harm. I am unaware of any precedent of this Court to the effect that psychological pain is not cognizable³² for constitutional purposes.

Hudson, 503 U.S. at 16 (Blackmun, J., concurring) (internal citation omitted); see also *St. Germain v. Goord*, No. 96-CV-1560 (RSP/DRH), 1997 WL 627552, at *3–4 (N.D.N.Y. Oct. 8, 1997) (inmate's misery, anguish, psychological pain, and fear found actionable).

Defendants argue that verbal threats alone are not enough to bring a claim under Section 1983. But this is not a case about a verbal argument. Simms was threatened while he was being assaulted. Verbal threats, accompanied by some physical force or injury, can violate the Eighth Amendment. As the case law makes clear, when threats are accompanied by conduct that increases the credibility of the threats, an inmate's constitutional rights are violated. See *Northington v. Jackson*, 973 F.2d 1518, 1522–24 (10th Cir. 1992) (alleged psychological injury resulting from sheriff's placement of revolver to inmate's head, accompanied by threats to shoot, held more than *de minimis*); *Burton v. Livingston*, 791 F.2d 97, 100–01 (8th Cir. 1986) (guard drawing weapon and threatening to shoot while using racially offensive language held more than *de minimis* use of force); *Douglas v. Marino*, 684 F. Supp. 395, 397–

32. "Cognizable" means that a court can recognize or identify something. Here, when the Court declares that psychological pain is cognizable for constitutional purposes, the Court means that psychological pain is something that the Court can take into account when considering a case alleging a constitutional violation has taken place.

98 (D.N.J. 1988) (allegation that prison employee brandished knife while threatening to stab prisoner stated Section 1983 claim).

It is clear even from the cases on which defendants rely that threats accompanied by physical conduct violate the Eighth Amendment. In *Jermosen v. Coughlin*, for example, the court held that verbal threats do not amount to a constitutional violation “unless accompanied by physical force or the present ability to effectuate the threat.” 878 F. Supp. 444, 449 (N.D.N.Y. 1995) (emphasis added). Similarly, in *McFadden v. Lucas*, the court stated, “mere threatening language” is not a constitutional violation where the “plaintiff has nowhere alleged that he was physically assaulted [or that] any touching of his person occurred at all.” 713 F.2d 143, 146 (5th Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 464 U.S. 998 (1983) (emphasis added); *see also Harris v. Keane*, 962 F. Supp. 397, 406 (S.D.N.Y. 1997) (“Allegations of threats, verbal harassment or profanity, *without any injury or damage*, do not state a claim under Section 1983.”) (emphasis added).

Unlike the cases cited by defendants—where the threats were unaccompanied by other conduct or the plaintiff was not physically abused—Robert Simms was threatened with beatings and death even as he was physically attacked. (Simms Aff. ¶ 12–13). The lack of any justification for these threats indicates that their purpose was to inflict psychological harm. *See infra* Part B. Simms’ placement in protective custody, where he might be assaulted without witnesses, only bolstered the threats’ credibility. *See Hudspeth v. Figins*, 584 F.2d 1345, 1347–48 (4th Cir. 1978) (guard’s threat that inmate would be shot supported by subsequent transfer to work detail supervised by armed guards).

Simms’ psychological pain was not *de minimis*. During the search process, he experienced humiliation, anxiety, and the terror of death or severe injury. Afterwards, fearing that Bennett, Lewis, and Wright were going to beat or kill him, Simms sank into a deep depression and contemplated suicide. Defendants’ argument that Simms’ suicidal thoughts should be disregarded because he could not actually kill himself misses the point that he suffered psychological pain. (Def. Mem. 6 n.1). He received psychological treatment from the Mental Health Clinic, which specifically noted that Simms had been harassed by corrections officers and that he was “depressed.” (Mental Health Evaluation Sheets). Simms also received counseling from Mullah Mark Denby and Dr. Margaret Phillips. To date, he suffers from nightmares of the incident. (Simms Aff. ¶ 22; Simms Dep. 43:15–44:2, 49:18–51:18; Simms letter, dated January 24, 1990). Thus, Simms’ mental pain is actionable.

Defendants characterize Simms’ psychological pain as not “rational” because (i) the threats were conditional; (ii) an investigation was conducted; and (iii) the threats of beatings and killing were never effectuated. (Def. Mem. 11–13). None of these arguments withstands scrutiny [close examination]. First, defendants’ suggestion that Simms’ fear of beating and death would only be justifiable had Bennett phrased his threats in the present tense—“I’m going to kill you now”—and that Simms should have taken comfort from the use of the conditional perfect in Bennett’s actual statement—“I should kill you”—assumes that Simms has a high-level understanding of grammar and an ability to identify different verb tenses under those circumstances.

Defendants’ second point, that Simms’ fear and terror during the assault on January 17, 1990, should have been ameliorated [made better] by defendants’ investigation taking place on January 26, 1990, is similarly far-fetched. Even after the attack, Simms could have derived little comfort from an internal investigation, given his previous experience with Penitentiary personnel. As to the merits of the investigation, the quality of internal reports rests on credibility—a jury issue. *See Payne v. Coughlin*, No. 82 Civ. 2284 (CSH), 1987 WL 10739, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. May 6, 1987).

Finally, as discussed above, verbal threats are indeed actionable where accompanied by physical force. It is not necessary for Simms to have actually been beaten, shot, stabbed, or killed to maintain this lawsuit. *See St. Germain*, 1997 WL 627552, at *3–4 (holding actionable inmate’s mental pain and fear resulting from corrections officers’ threats to “beat the hell out of plaintiff” which never materialized). Defendants rely on *Doe v. Welborn*, 110 F.3d 520 (7th Cir. 1997), in arguing that Simms’ fear of beating and death are not compensable since the threats never materialized. That reliance is misplaced. *Doe* is a conditions-of-confinement case; this is a case about excessive use of force. As *Doe* itself states: “What is necessary to show sufficient harm for purposes of the Cruel and Unusual

Punishments Clause depends on the claim at issue.” 110 F.3d at 524. Thus, while the psychological harm of the plaintiff in *Doe* did not rise to “the extreme deprivations” required to make out a conditions-of-confinement claim, Simms’ psychological injury is actionable because “a plaintiff in an excessive force case need not allege significant injury in order to survive dismissal.” *Id.* (internal citations and quotation marks omitted). Under the circumstances, the fear and other mental pain, which Simms suffered due to Bennett’s threats of beating and death, accompanied by Bennett’s aggressive physical actions, were clearly rational.

(b) Officer Bennett Acted Maliciously and Sadistically to Cause Harm

For claims of excessive force, the state of mind requirement turns on whether the prison official applied the force “maliciously and sadistically to cause harm.” *Hudson*, 503 U.S. at 6 (quoting *Johnson v. Glick*, 481 F.2d 1028, 1033 (2d Cir. 1973), *cert. denied*, 414 U.S. 1033 (1973)). In making that determination, the trier of fact is to consider the following factors: (i) “the extent of the plaintiff’s injuries;” (ii) “the need for the application of force;” (iii) “the correlation [relationship] between that need and amount of force used;” (iv) “the threat reasonably perceived by the defendants;” and (v) “any efforts made by the defendants to temper [decrease] the severity of a forceful response.” *Romano v. Howarth*, 998 F.2d 101, 105 (2d Cir. 1993) (citing *Hudson*, 503 U.S. at 7).

(i) Plaintiff Simms Suffered Physical and Mental Harm

As a result of Bennett’s use of excessive force and threats of beating and death, Simms suffered physical and mental injury. *See supra* Sections 1(b) and (c)

(ii) There Was No Need for Force or Death Threats

Where, as here, there is evidence that an attack by a corrections officer is unprovoked or without sufficient justification, courts generally will deny summary judgment. *See, e.g., Corselli v. Coughlin*, 842 F.2d 23, 27 (2d Cir. 1988) (reversing summary judgment where jury could find defendant initiated argument and struck inmate without justification); *Moore v. Agosto*, No. 93 civ. 4835, 1996 WL 125660, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 20, 1996) (summary judgment denied where plaintiff maintained defendants initiated the confrontation), *aff’d*, 164 F.3d 618 (2d Cir. 1998).

Defendants claim Bennett was justified in using force because of Simms’ “admitted” refusal to follow defendants’ instructions to submit to a strip-search, stand away from the bullpen bars, stand where directed in the search room, and place his clothing in the designated place. (Def. Mem. 6–8).

Defendants’ arguments are undermined by the simple fact that Bennett attacked Simms *prior* to the issuance of any of these instructions. The threats of violence began as Simms sat in the bullpen, and the physical attack began as soon as Simms entered the search room. (Simms Aff. ¶¶ 8, 11; Simms Dep. 19:20–20:3, 24:25–25:9, 25:14–25:14). Moreover, when Simms was ordered to strip, he complied. (Simms Aff. ¶¶ 15, 18; Simms Dep. 32:15–21; Simms letter dated January 24, 1990).

The other so-called “instructions” illustrate the malice and sadism motivating Bennett’s attack. For example, Bennett’s alleged “instruction” to stand away from the bullpen bars was in fact stated as follows:

You revolting cradle robber. Get the hell out of my face, you pedophile. You nauseate me! Get the hell away from the bars before I beat you senseless.

(Simms Aff. ¶ 9; Simms Dep. 21:2–15). In addition, the purported “instruction” to stand in a particular spot was nothing but a malicious taunt. Bennett indeed told Simms to stand in a particular spot. However, each time Simms moved to the place indicated, Bennett screamed, pointed to a different spot, grabbed Simms’ arm, and swung him to the new location. (Simms Aff. ¶ 14; Simms Dep. 27:22–27:2).

The expressions of disgust and hatred, which continued throughout the beating and accompanied the death threats, were a product of Bennett’s personal feelings, not a good faith effort to maintain discipline. The evidence is clear that Bennett knew Simms’ charges prior to the attack:

- (1) Felding, the booking officer who prepared the booking sheet stating Simms' charges, stood in the search room while Simms was assaulted and searched (Booking Sheet; Bennett Dep. 31:10–25, 41:20–42:3, 49:3–7, 52:8–53:8; Def. Interrog. Resp. No. 7);
- (2) Bennett, Lewis, and Wright admitted to talking about inmates' charges (Bennett Dep. 56:17–25; Lewis Dep. 26:2–18; Wright Dep. 41:16–19);
- (3) Bennett admitted that he had access to inmates' charges (Bennett Dep. 53:2–54:8; see also Lewis Dep. 26:2–18); and
- (4) The threats are replete with references of Simms being a child pornographer (Simms Aff. ¶¶ 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 18; Simms Dep. 19:14–25, 25:6–7).

The fact that malice motivated Bennett's acts against Simms are explained, in part, by Bennett's testimony that he finds sex offenses committed against minors more disgusting than other crimes committed by inmates. (Bennett Dep. 58:3–10). Moreover, Bennett was emboldened by his "amused" audience of corrections officers in the search room. (Simms Aff. ¶ 12; Simms Dep. 27:23–28:2; Def. Interrog. Resp. No. 7).

Defendants contend that the force used was necessary to avoid the "potential" security risks associated with a backlog of detainees waiting to be processed. (Def. Mem. 8). However, the "potential" risk could never have been a reality here. The morning of January 17, 1990, only Simms and one other detainee were waiting to be processed. (Simms Aff. ¶ 6).

(iii) The Amount and Type of Force Used Were Disproportionate to the Need

There is no correlation here between the need for force and the amount of force used. Given that Simms offered no physical or verbal resistance nor refused any orders, Bennett's pushing, shoving, swinging, punching, and simultaneous threatening with death and severe injury were clearly excessive.

Even assuming *arguendo* (for the sake of argument) that Simms did refuse to strip, the circumstances would not require the amount of physical force that Bennett used. Bennett himself admitted that Simms was not violent during the strip-search. (Bennett Dep. 48:14). *See Martinez v. Rosado*, 614 F.2d 829, 831–32 (2d Cir. 1980) (violation of prison rule and refusal to obey direct order do not alone justify physical assault without evidence of physical resistance by inmate or other indication that amount of force was proper); *see also Corselli*, 842 F.2d at 27 (even where there is evidence that inmate may have failed to follow an order, officer can still be found to have used excessive or gratuitous force). Moreover, it is hard to see how threatening to shoot, beat, and stab Simms would get Simms to perform the desired action of stripping. At a minimum, this is a question for the jury. *See, e.g., Trice v. Strack*, No. 94 Civ. 4470 (BSJ), 1998 WL 633807, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 14, 1998) (whether force was applied maliciously and sadistically left for jury where defendants struck, tackled, and kicked plaintiff who may have precipitated conduct by waving underwear in one defendant's face).

(iv) Bennett Could Not Reasonably Have Perceived Simms as a Threat.

It is clear that Bennett could not reasonably have seen Simms as a threat. On January 17, 1990, Simms was 5'4" and approximately 135 pounds, as compared to the taller, more muscular defendant Bennett. (Simms Aff. ¶ 8; Simms Dep. 19:6–9; Booking Sheet). In addition, while Bennett was accompanied by Lewis and four to six other corrections officers in the search room, Simms was the only inmate present. (Bennett Dep. 39:9–14, 48:3–11; Def. Interrog. Resp. Nos. 2, 7).

(v) Bennett Has Demonstrated No Effort to Temper His Response.

Finally, defendants have suggested no efforts by Bennett to temper the severity of the response. As noted above, Bennett assaulted and threatened Robert Simms *prior* to any peaceful request that Simms strip, and continued to do so for another 45 minutes.

E. B. DEFENDANT WRIGHT EVINCED DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE WHEN HE FAILED TO PROTECT ROBERT SIMMS FROM BENNETT'S PHYSICAL ASSAULT AND ACCOMPANYING DEATH THREATS.

Defendants argue summary judgment should be granted for Sergeant Wright because (i) Wright did not participate in or witness the physical attack and death threats directed toward Simms, and (ii) Wright took adequate steps to ensure that Simms' constitutional rights were not violated. (Def. Mem. 5–6). However, summary judgment is not appropriate because Wright acted with deliberate indifference when he failed to protect Simms from Bennett's physical assault and death threats.

The legal standard is that a supervisor may be liable under Section 1983 for the actions of his supervisees where, as here, the supervisor exhibits "deliberate indifference" to an inmate's safety. There is no requirement of direct participation in the constitutional violation. *See, e.g., Wright v. Smith*, 21 F.3d 496, 501 (2d Cir. 1994). Deliberate indifference exists where (1) there is a substantial risk of serious harm to an inmate, and (2) the prison official knows of the risk and disregards it by failing to take steps to prevent harm to the inmate. *See Farmer*, 511 U.S. at 834; *see also Hayes v. New York City Dep't of Corr.*, 84 F.3d 614, 620 (2d Cir. 1996).

- i. Robert Simms was at a substantial risk of serious harm.

Here, the first requirement for a finding of deliberate indifference, "substantial risk of serious harm," is clearly met. A violent assault perpetrated without justification and solely for the purpose of causing harm creates a substantial risk of serious harm. *See supra* I.B.

- (b) Wright knew of and disregarded the harm to Simms by not acting to prevent it.

The second requirement of deliberate indifference, culpable intent, is also met. The evidence establishes Wright had knowledge that Robert Simms faced a substantial risk of serious harm on the morning of January 17, 1990, regardless of whether Wright actually witnessed the physical abuse and death threats. Specifically:

- (1) Wright admitted in deposition that he proceeded into the search room after hearing "loud screaming" coming from that room. (Wright Dep. 26:23–28:23, 48:23–25, 54:4–6). Wright's Incident Report, stating that Wright "heard noise" coming from the search room, confirms this. (Incident Report of Sgt. Wright).
- (2) Once the strip-search was completed, Simms told Wright that Bennett physically assaulted him and threatened him with his life. (Simms Aff. ¶ 16; Simms Dep. 37:13–22).
- (3) Wright admitted in deposition that Simms had filed a complaint about Officer Bennett. (Wright Dep. 13:02–16:20).

The evidence further establishes that Wright disregarded the substantial risk of serious harm that he knew Simms faced. Even after hearing suspicious noises coming from the search room and being told that Bennett had attacked Simms, Wright did not immediately investigate the situation, reprimand (warn or punish) Bennett, or even stay in the search room until the booking and search process was complete. After Simms told Wright he needed Wright's help, Wright told Simms to "shut the hell up and take off your clothes." (Simms Dep. 38:18–20). Then, after specifically being informed of the abuse, Sergeant Wright merely told Simms, "Well, this is jail!" and walked out of the search room. (Simms Aff. ¶ 17; Simms Dep. 39:12–14; Simms letter, dated January 24, 1990). Given the evidence indicating that Wright had knowledge of the risk Simms faced, this indifferent response cannot be held reasonable as a matter of law.

That Wright failed to prevent any further harm to Simms is proven by the fact that Wright left Simms in the room with Bennett to suffer further abuse. Simms was indeed subjected to more abuse when Wright left the search room. Once Wright exited, Bennett shoved Simms, sending him reeling across the search room. Bennett screamed, "You are a piece of crap! You are a disgusting kiddie porn loving animal who deserves to die. I am going to make sure someone's going to kill you. Your days are numbered." (Simms Aff. ¶ 19; Simms Dep. 34:9–15; Compl. Pt. III at 6).

The failure to intervene to prevent harm to an inmate constitutes deliberate indifference, subjecting the supervisor to liability. *See, e.g., Robins v. Meecham*, 60 F.3d 1436, 1442 (9th Cir. 1995) (summary judgment denied where defendants were present but failed to intervene to prevent another prison official from firing a shotgun at inmate); *Buckner v. Hollins*, 983 F.2d 119, 122–23 (8th Cir. 1993) (where defendant failed to prevent prison official from beating plaintiff, jury could find deliberate indifference for defendant’s failure to intervene); *see also Hayes*, 84 F.3d at 621 (reversing summary judgment for corrections officers where plaintiff advised officer he was in danger prior to attack, and record revealed no protective measures taken); *Livingston v. Rivera*, No. 94-CV-5319, 1999 WL 26902, at *3 (E.D.N.Y. Jan. 20, 1999) (officer’s statement and other circumstances, suggesting defendant had knowledge that inmate was exposed to imminent serious harm, precluded summary judgment). Here, there is substantial evidence that Wright disregarded a clear and obvious risk of harm to Simms. As a result, Simms suffered further physical assault and threats of beating and death. Wright’s failure to take any steps—much less any reasonable ones—to prevent this abuse makes him liable, and at minimum, precludes summary judgment in his favor.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment should be denied.

Dated: _____

<<date submitted>> <<City, State>>

Respectfully submitted,

<<Attorney Firm Name>>³³

By: _____

Rachel A. Felder (RF-XXXX)³⁴

<<Attorney’s Address>>

<<City, State>>

<<Phone number>>

Attorney for Plaintiff

Robert K. Simms

33. If you are submitting your memorandum of law *pro se*, you should put your name here.

34. If you are submitting your memorandum of law *pro se*, you should put your name, address, and contact information (including your inmate number, if applicable,) here.